# Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RIGOBERTO JOSE MORENO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERIC AUKEE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-04206-EMC

## **ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S** MOTION TO RELEASE FUNDS

Docket No. 7

Plaintiff Rigoberto Jose Moreno, proceeding pro se, filed this lawsuit against a long list of defendants. Docket No. 1. On July 31, 2019, the Court granted his request to proceed in forma pauperis. Docket No. 4. However, the Court dismissed his complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) because it failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Id. Mr. Moreno was given leave to file an amended complaint no later than August 30, 2019. Id. Mr. Moreno has now filed a Motion to Release Funds for Order Authorizing Distribution of Funds Held in Court by the Department of Justice. Docket No. 7.

### I. **DISCUSSION**

Federal district courts have an affirmative duty to ensure that they have subject matter jurisdiction over the cases that come before them. See, e.g., Gonzalez v. Thaler, 565 U.S. 134, 141 (2012) ("When a requirement goes to subject-matter jurisdiction, courts are obligated to consider sua sponte issues that the parties have disclaimed or have not presented." (citing United States v. Cotton, 535 U.S. 625, 630 (2002))). Because the Court previously found that Mr. Moreno's original complaint failed to state a claim and because no amended complaint has yet been filed, the Court cannot presently ascertain whether it has subject matter jurisdiction over Mr. Moreno's case. It is possible that the Court will have subject matter jurisdiction; thus, when he files his

amended complaint, Mr. Moreno is directed to ensure compliance with Civil Local Rule 3–5, which requires that each complaint "identify the statutory or other basis for federal jurisdiction and the facts supporting such jurisdiction." Civ. Loc. R. 3–5. Mr. Moreno is also reminded to comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, pursuant to which all complaints filed in federal court must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief" and "a demand for the relief sought." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a).

In addition, no Defendants have yet been served in this case. Nor were any Defendants given notice of this motion. Civil Local Rule 7–2 requires that all motions "must be filed, served and noticed in writing on the motion calendar of the assigned Judge." Civ. Loc. R. 7–2. Because Defendants in this matter have not been given notice of either the case itself or the instant motion, they have not had an opportunity to be heard on the issues, and the Court finds it improper to consider Plaintiff's Motion to Release Funds at this time. As a result, the Motion to Release Funds is **DENIED**, and Plaintiff is permitted to refile the motion once an amended complaint has been filed and Defendants have been served. The motion should more clearly state what the Funds in question are, who holds them, and what the basis of Plaintiff's claim for those funds is.

# II. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Mr. Moreno's Motion to Release Funds for Order Authorizing Distribution of Funds Held in Court by the Department of Justice. Mr. Moreno is reminded to file an amended complaint no later than August 30, 2019; that complaint must contain a short and plain statement of each claim for relief he wishes to assert, and it must identify the provisions of law and the set of facts that support each claim. Furthermore, the complaint should explain the Court's jurisdiction to hear the claims asserted by Plaintiff. Should Mr. Moreno again fail to comply with Rule 8 and Civil Local Rule 3–5, he risks dismissal with prejudice. Mr. Moreno is forewarned that failure to file an amended complaint by the August 30, 2019 deadline will lead to the dismissal of his case.

Once again, Mr. Moreno is encouraged to seek the free information that is available to pro se litigants from the Legal Help Desk. Help Desks are located at the San Francisco and Oakland Courthouses and assistance is available by appointment. The San Francisco Help Desk is located

# United States District Court Northern District of California

at 450 Golden Gate Ave., 15th Floor, Room 2796, San Francisco, CA 94102. The Oakland Help
Desk is located at 1301 Clay Street, 4th Floor, Room 470S,Oakland, CA 94612. Appointments
can be made by calling (415) 782-8982. See also http://cand.uscourts.gov/helpcentersf. A free
handbook for pro se litigants, entitled Representing Yourself in Federal Court: A Handbook for
Pro Se Litigants, is also available free of charge for download at
https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/prosehandbook.
This order disposes of Docket No. 7.
IT IS SO ORDERED.
Dated: August 23, 2019

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge